

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 19-63 are pending in the instant application. Claims 13 and 52 have been objected to by the Examiner, and claims 1-17 and 19-63 have been rejected as being allegedly anticipated by, or in the alternative, obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,503 issued to Daly. Claims 1, 14, 20, 40, and 53 have been amended. Claims 10, 11, 13, 25, 26, 49, 50, 52, 61, and 62 have been canceled. The Applicants submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance for at least the reasons presented herein. No new matter has been entered.

Claim Objections under 37 C.F.R. 1.75

The Examiner has objected to claims 13 and 52 under 37 CFR 1.75 as being substantial duplicates of claims 9 and 48, respectively. The Applicants have canceled claims 13 and 52, which should alleviate these grounds for objection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-9, 13-17, 40-48, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,122,503 issued to Daly.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 1-9, 13-17, 40-48, and 52 for at least the reasons presented herein. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verlegant Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the * * * claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Barient, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988).

Moreover, the single source must disclose all of the claimed elements "arranged as in the claim." *Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co.*, 749 F.2d 707, 716, 223 U.S.P.Q. 1264, 1271 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Applicants amended claim 1 recites a method for updating an internal database associated with a first wireless device comprising "receiving a second item of information related to an autonomous registration event by the wireless device, the second item of information obtained via at least one of: protocol analysis; a registration feed; a probe in communication with at least one SS7 link; and a feed from an STP link." Daly does not recite these features. Rather, Daly teaches a registration notice is sent by IS-41 signaling (col. 8, lines 47-50). Accordingly, the Applicants submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Daly. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-9 depend from what should now be an allowable claim 1. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 2-9 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections.

Claims 14 and 40 have been amended in a similar manner as that described above with respect to claim 1. For at least this reason, it is believed that claims 14 and 40 are patentable over Daly. Claims 15-17 depend from what should now be an allowable claim 14. Claims 41-48 depend from what should now be an allowable claim 40. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 15-17 and 41-48 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of claims 14-17 and 40-48.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 10-12, 19, 20-27, 49-51, 53-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Daly. Claims 10, 11, 25, 26, 49, 50, 61, and 62 have been canceled. As indicated above, claims 1, 14, and 40 are patentable over Daly. Claim 12 depends from claim 1, claim 19 depends from claim 14, and claim 51

depends from claim 40. For at least this reason, the Applicants submit that claims 12, 19, and 51 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 20 has been amended in a similar manner as that described above with respect to claims 1 and 14. For at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claims 1 and 14, the Applicants submit that claim 20 is in condition for allowance. Claims 21-24 and 27 depend from what should now be an allowable claim 20. For at least this reason, the Applicants submit that claims 21-24 and 27 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 53 has been amended in a similar manner as that described above with respect to claims 1, 14, 20, and 40. For at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claims 1, 14, 20, and 40, the Applicants submit that claim 53 is in condition for allowance. Claims 54-60 and 63 depend from what should now be an allowable claim 53. For at least this reason, the Applicants submit that claims 54-60 and 63 are in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: Marisa J. Dubuc
Marisa J. Dubuc
Registration No. 46,673
Confirmation No. 8769
Customer No. 36192

Date: April 27, 2005
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone No: (860) 286-2929
Fax No: (860) 286-0115